

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 25 are pending. Claims 1 – 4, 8 – 22 and 25 are under consideration and claims 5 – 7, 23 and 24 are withdrawn from consideration.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 22 and 25 are amended. (Withdrawn claims 6, 7, 23 and 24 are also amended.) No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

Claims 10 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as alleged being indefinite. The Examiner alleged that there is no antecedent basis for red and green “phosphorescent” emitting layers in claims 10 and 18 and for the recitation of “I” in claim 10. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 10 and 18 are amended to positively recite that the red emitting layer and the green emitting layer are phosphorescent emitting layers. Claim 10 is amended to delete “I,” which appears to be a stray typo. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8, 11-16, 19, 21, 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kamatani et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0068526 A1). The Examiner alleged that Kamatani et al. discloses iridium compounds represented by the formula L2ML’ and/or L3M for use in the emitting layer of an organic electroluminescent display device. In particular, the Examiner alleged that Kamatani et al. discloses the applicant’s elected species and other compounds within the scope of the phosphorescent dopant as defined in independent claims 1, 12 and 22. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 1 and 22 are amended herein to include the proviso that at least one of L and L’ in the formula L2ML’ has 15 or more carbon atoms and is not a phenylisoquinoline. Claim 12 is amended to include the proviso that L in the formula L3M is not a phenylisoquinoline. Moreover, claims 6, 14, 15, 23 and 25 are amended to delete phenylisoquinoline and phenylisoquinoline compounds and claims 7 and 24 are amended to delete compounds that contain a phenylisoquinoline ligand and do not have another ligand having 15 or more carbon atoms.

Kamatani et al. does not teach or suggest any phosphorescent dopant or emitting compound represented by L2ML', and wherein M is a transition metal selected from the group consisting of Ir, Pt, Zn and Os, L and L' are bidentate ligands coordinated with carbon and nitrogen, and at least one of L and L' has 15 or more carbon atoms and is not a phenylisoquinoline. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 16-18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamatani et al. as applied to claims 1-3, 8, 11-16, 19, 21, 22 and 25, and further in view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0042848 A1) and Yu et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2004/0094768 A1). The Examiner alleged that Kamatani et al. discloses iridium compounds represented by formulas L2ML' and L3M for use as red-emitting phosphorescent materials in full-color display devices. The Examiner acknowledged that Kamatani et al. does not explicitly teach a full-color display device having red, green and blue emitting layers in which the blue emitting layer is a fluorescent emitting layer. The Examiner alleged that Park et al. and Yu et al. disclose full-color display devices having red, green and blue emitting layers in which at least one emitter is a phosphorescent emitter and at least one emitter is a fluorescent emitter. Regarding claims 9 and 20, the Examiner alleged that Park et al. teach the use of a hole blocking layer over the phosphorescent emitter layers and that Yu et al. teaches that an electron injection /transport layer may be deposited over each of the red, green and blue emitter layers. Regarding claims 10 and 18, the Examiner alleged that Yu et al. teaches that the blue emitter layer may be formed over the red and green emitter layers. The Examiner further alleged that a full-color organic electroluminescent display device comprising a phosphorescent dopant was known in the art at the time of the invention, as alleged 14 demonstrated by Kamatani et al. and that the structural features of the device as set for the in claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 18, and 20 were known in the art for full-color organic electroluminescent display devices as allegedly demonstrated by Park et al. and Yu et al. The Examiner took the position that it would have been obvious to make a full-color display device using a phosphorescent dopant as allegedly taught by Kamatani et al. using structural features allegedly known in the art of full-color display devices as alleged disclosed by Park et al. and Yu et al. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As noted above, Kamatani et al. does not teach or suggest the phosphorescent dopant or emitting compound of amended independent claims 1, 12 and 22. Likewise, Park et al. and

Yu et al. do not teach or suggest any phosphorescent dopant or emitting compound represented by L2ML', and wherein M is a transition metal selected from the group consisting of Ir, Pt, Zn and Os, L and L' are bidentate ligands coordinated with carbon and nitrogen, and at least one of L and L' has 15 or more carbon atoms and is not a phenylisoquinoline. Accordingly, Kamatani et al., Park et al. and Yu et al., singly or combined, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the independent claims. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: Feb 9, 2007

By: 
Ralph T. Webb
Registration No. 33,047

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510